Table of Contents

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: MAY 24 - 26, 1993

ARKANSAS STATE REPORT

SEPTEMBER 21, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

THE ORKAND CORPORATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDIX A - State of Arkansas Exhibits

ARKANSAS STATE REPORT
Site Visit: May 24 - 26, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name:	Food Stamp Automated Client Tracking System (FACTS)
Start Date:	1979
Completion Date:	1982
Contractor:	Gulf Systems, Inc.
Transfer From:	Developed in-house
Cost:	
Actual:	Unknown
Projected:	Unknown
FSP Share:	Unknown
FSP %:	Unknown
Number of Users:	1,269
Basic Architecture:	
Mainframe:	IBM 3090-200E MVS/XA
Workstations:	3270 type workstations
Telecommunications Network:	T1 lines; multiple 56 KB lines to 5600 baud tail circuits
System Profile:	
Programs:	Food Stamp

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Arkansas Department of Human Services (DHS) administers the Food Stamp Program (FSP). DHS has a number of divisions:

- Division of Volunteerism
- Division of Children and Family Services
- Office of Chief Counsel
- Division of Aging and Adult Services
- Division of County Operations
- Division of Finance
- Division of Developmental Disabilities Services
- Division of Management Services
- Division of Economic and Medical Services
- Division of Services for the Blind
- Division of Mental Health Services
- Division of Youth Services

Four of these divisions are involved in FSP activities and support. These are the Divisions of County Operations, Management Services (DMS), Economic and Medicaid Services (EMS) and Finance. Within DMS there are four offices:

- Support Services
- Human Resources
- Planning, Research, and Analysis
- Information Systems

The Office of Information Systems (OIS) is responsible for information systems planning, software application development, management support, and user support. OIS developed and maintains FACTS, which operates on equipment maintained by the Department of Computer Services (DCS).

There are five offices within EMS:

- Office of Program & Administrative Support, which includes quality control, special investigations, and corrective action.

- Office of Medical Services, which includes medical assistance, utilization review, prescription drugs, etc.

- Office of Long Term Care, which includes program/policy support, certification, licensure and investigations, utilization review, and residential and adult day care.

- Office of Community Services, which includes block grants, home energy assistance program, emergency shelter grants, and the homeless program.

- Office of Economic Services (OES), which includes emergency services, program development and support, field operations, and child support enforcement.

Within OES, the Program Development and Support Section oversees both FSP and the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program.

The field operations section of OES is responsible for administering all DHS EMS programs in the field, including the AFDC JOBS and FSP Employment & Training (E&T) Programs (known as Project Success).

County administrators report to the Division of County Operations. They are responsible for clerical staffing and coordination among the different divisions. They have no responsibility for programs, except to handle recipient and client complaints. The county administrators report to five area directors who report to the director and assistant director of the Division.

On July 1, 1993, a few organizational changes were to take place. The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program was to be moved to the Department of Health, the Division of Rehabilitative Services was to move to the Department of Education, and the Office of Child Support Enforcement was to move to Finance and Administration.

There are 80 local welfare offices located within 75 counties. Four counties have dual offices. The largest offices are Jefferson County (Pine Bluff) and Pulaski South (Little Rock).

DCS maintains the computer center on which Food Stamp Automated Client Tracking System (FACTS) operates.

The State has had severe budget restrictions, but in the current fiscal year (FY), the budget situation has improved to the extent that some new staff will be hired and DHS will be able to implement its plan to place additional personal computers (PC) with the county supervisors. The legislature passed a soft drink tax which brings in additional revenues, earmarked for the Medicaid Program.

The unemployment rate in Arkansas declined from 1983 to 1990, with a high of 10.1 percent in 1983 and a low of 6.9 in 1990. The unemployment rate has increased slightly since 1990, reaching 7.3 percent in 1991.

The Fiscal Survey of States, published in October 1992 by the National Governors' Association and National Association of State Budget Officers, presents the following information concerning Arkansas:

- Arkansas was one of 11 States which experienced State budget expenditure growth in the 5 to 9 percent range in FY 1993.

- The economic outlook for the Southeast region is fairly positive. The regional rate of unemployment of 7.6 percent was below the national average of 7.8 percent and the

percent of change of personal income was 3.0 percent, above the national average of 2.4 percent.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

FSP is administered by the Program Development and Support Section of OES, within EMS. The AFDC Program is also administered by this group. FSP is supported by FACTS.

The FSP E&T Program, also located within this organizational unit, is operated in 47 counties by the Field Operations Section. The FSP E&T Program, along with the AFDC JOBS Program, is not supported by FACTS, but instead is a manually operated system.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

FSP household participation increased by 24.4 percent between 1988 and 1992. Individual participation in the program increased by 22.1 percent during this same time period. Arkansas has no General Assistance Program.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	26,621	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FSP					
Households	102,489	95,207	87,282	83,003	82,371
Individual	278,412	262,194	239,762	228,050	228,020
Medicaid	369,354[1]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Since FACTS is an FSP-only system, the historical participation rates for other public assistance (PA) programs are not relevant to the discussion that follows. In the event that Arkansas integrates its systems, the current and projected participation rates for the other programs involved would be relevant.

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has increased from 10.9:1 in 1988 to 15.0:1 in 1992.

[1] Includes AFDC caseload. Based on data in *Year at a Glance*, an Arkansas publication.

Arkansas' average monthly benefit issuance per household has increased over the last five years, as shown in Table 2.2.[2]

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	$169.45	$162.51	$150.41	$131.23	$127.04

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Arkansas' FSP administrative costs for the past five years are shown in Table 2.3.[3] While total administrative costs for the past five years have steadily increased, the average cost per household has decreased slightly.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	$13,830,414	$13,611,638	$13,626,493	$12,192,831	$11,646,942
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$11.32	$12.09	$13.22	$12.26	$11.72

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

FACTS first became operational as a batch system in 1979 and was enhanced to become an on-line system in 1982. Further enhancements were made in 1987 to improve processing efficiency and add some data elements to the file structures. Any system impacts on FSP operational performance would have been most noticeable in the early 1980s; the information on program performance presented below does not reflect any changes that can be attributed to the implementation of FACTS.

[2] The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year.

[3] The number of households and FSP Federal Administrative Costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

2.4.1 Staffing

Arkansas has 706 allocated caseworker positions for the performance of both intake and ongoing case management functions. There are 64 eligibility worker (EW) supervisors and 14 issuance center workers. There are 73 county supervisors. DHS field staff are supported by 412 clerical staff, 120 of whom are terminal operators.

After the implementation of the on-line enhancement to FACTS, the number of issuance workers was reduced from 49 to the current 14 workers. Central office data input and clerical staff were no longer necessary once field offices began to input the case information.

Over the last five years there have been reductions in field staff. At this time, the average caseload per worker is 340 cases. This is for the generic workers who handle AFDC, Medicaid, and FSP combined cases. There are a few exceptions in some offices.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes

Exhibit A-2.1 in Appendix A reflects the State's responsiveness to regulatory changes. Of the fourteen provisions, Arkansas implemented those listed below after the Federally-required implementation date.

- Extended Resource Exclusion of Farm Property and Vehicles (CFR 273.8(e)(5)), with an implementation date of 7/1/89. Arkansas implemented this regulation on 9/1/89, three months after the regulation was published in the Federal Register on 6/7/89.

- Exclusion of Advanced Earned Income Tax Credit Payments (CFR 273.9(c)(14)) with an implementation date of 1/1/88. This regulation was implemented on March 1, 1989. According to Arkansas, implementation was delayed until it could obtain information on the implementing policy.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Arkansas' official combined error rate, which is provided in Table 2.4, fluctuated between 1988 and 1992. The 1992 error rate increased to 7.47.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	7.47	7.05	5.99	7.22	5.44

The State indicated that after the on-line enhancement to FACTS in 1982, errors in wages and salaries were reduced because workers had access to the State wage and salary

information. In FY 1980, before on-line system implementation, the FSP error rate was 9.1 percent; this rate dropped to 5.4 percent by FY 1988. Over the period of time from 1988 to 1992, the State undertook several efforts that may have had an impact on error rates. Changes to the Child Support Enforcement matching system were made to automatically recalculate food stamp budgets based on Child Support Enforcement information. A computer screen was developed to permit the worker to check the FSP benefits whenever the AFDC grant changed to see if the food stamp amount changed. A targeting approach for Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) matches was developed to focus caseworker attention on the most productive matches. In addition, reminder notices were sent to households with fluctuating earned income with certification periods of at least five months. A Food Stamp Streamlining Team was preparing a series of waivers to FNS requesting approval to operate a quarterly reporting system.

The unregressed error rate for 1993 is 5.63 percent. Regressed, it will probably be around 6.0 percent, slightly higher than the 5.9 percent that would make Arkansas eligible for enhanced funding for correction action.

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Arkansas has seen a consistent increase in both claims established and claims collected with the exception of claims collected in 1990, which decreased modestly from claims collected in the prior year. A separate system, the Overpayments System, supports claims and recoveries.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	$1,211,514	$972,839	$889,671	$847,922	$970,080
Total Claims Collected	$938,357	$783,794	$713,375	$759,375	$841,371
As a % of Total Claims Established	77.5%	80.6%	80.2%	89.6%	86.7%

Arkansas has put the Federal Tax Intercept Program in place and is just finishing its first year, so the increase in collections that occurred between 1991 and 1992 cannot be attributed to the tax offset. An attorney who had been assigned to Overpayments worked full-time during that period, increasing the number of cases that were taken to court and increasing the number of judgements on claims. For the first year of the Federal tax offset, Arkansas was able to recover $735,000.

As food stamps are mailed, FACTS reads the overpayment system, looking for a code indicating that a recoupment should take place. Eligibility workers prepare claim forms and submit them to the recovery unit which checks the workers' calculations and information on the claim. The claim is sent into the accounts receivable system and the overpayments system automatically generates a notice to the client. The central recovery unit has 10 people who are responsible for recovering for FSP, AFDC, Medicaid, and other smaller programs. The recovery unit collects State income taxes and monitors claim status on a monthly basis. At this time, the recovery unit staff indicated there was little else that could be done to increase the percentage of claims collected.

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

DHS staff indicated that FACTS is meeting all Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) system requirements now. There was no mention of a post-implementation review.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

Although FACTS is an FSP-only system, generic caseworkers are utilized and other systems in support of other programs are accessed through the same terminals. FSP operations are also supported by the following systems:

- IEVS - a batch component of FACTS, was implemented in October 1986 and also supports AFDC.
- Overpayment System - a statewide system for FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid claims and recoupments;
- Arkansas Client Eligibility System (ACES) - an on-line eligibility system for AFDC and Medicaid that was implemented in 1984 and uses the same terminals that were placed into field offices for FACTS.

The average number of cases pending on a monthly basis ranges from 8,400 to 8,800 cases.

The average monthly caseload per worker has increased over the last 5 years. There has been an increase in case backlogs with the decreases in staff and increases in caseloads.

Out of a list of 77 commonly automated functions, 25 were automated and 24 were partially automated on FACTS.

3.1 System Functionality

FSP is supported by FACTS; AFDC and Medicaid are supported by ACES. Clients and applicants are served by generic caseworkers in local welfare offices. Caseworkers have access to an on-line terminal, but do not input information on the terminal; they use the

terminals to access on-line information about the case. FSP utilizes a 12-page application form that is separate from that used by AFDC and Medicaid. A joint AFDC and FSP form has been developed but was not yet approved at the time of the site visit. Caseworkers enter data onto turnaround documents for input by terminal operators. There is at least one terminal operator per field office. The terminal operator is supervised by the county administrator. EWs report to the EW supervisor who reports to the Division of Economic and Medical Assistance.

- ***Registration.*** An applicant must complete, at a minimum, the first page of the application form and the expedited issuance questions. Based on this information, the receptionist, EW, or supervisor, without the assistance of automation, determines whether the applicant requires expedited issuance. If so, an interview is scheduled for the same day or the next day. Information from page one of the application form is entered into the system by the terminal operator to register the applicant on the system.

  FACTS assigns a register number to the applicant that is unique to each county. It includes the county code with a unique sequential number for each fiscal year. At the end of the fiscal year, each county can use this information to identify the number of applicants within the county for the year. The Social Security Number (SSN) is used as the case number.

  An automated search is conducted to determine whether the client is participating in AFDC or Medicaid. If the client has previously participated, but the case has been closed, a match will not be found. The search is conducted for the head of household and any members that are included on page one of the application form. If additional members are not included at the time of registration, a search is performed after the interview for all household members, to a maximum of 35 members.

  When the search is performed, FACTS utilizes a cross-reference file which looks at the ACES database when the terminal operator is in the FACTS system; when the operator is in the ACES system, the file is used as a cross-reference to the FACTS system.

  The terminal operator enters the SSN and the transfer field at the top of the screen to go to the cross-reference file. The operator can then see every case with which the individual SSN is associated. By moving the cursor down to the record of interest and hitting the enter key, the operator can access the case. The operator uses the hot key to get back to FACTS. If there is income or resources in the record, the operator makes a print screen of the information for inclusion in the case record.

  The terminal operator submits SSNs to IEVS to check for wage and unemployment data sent to the Employment Security Division (ESD). This is done every Friday night. At the time of the interview, the match may or may not

have been done. Before the interview, an on-line search of the State Department of Labor's ESD database is performed. A print screen of the information is made for inclusion in the case file.

The search for duplicate participation at the time of registration is performed on the SSN of each household member that is included on the first page of the applicant form. Name, sex, and race are not used. FNS has directed the State of Arkansas to remove sex from the application form and, therefore, the FACTS system is being changed to exclude this data element.

- ***Eligibility Determination.*** The EW conducts the interview, verifying information provided by the household and completing the application in its entirety. After the interview, if the worker determines that the client is eligible, the worker will complete a data entry form. If the client is not eligible, the worker completes another form.

  If the client is eligible (as determined by the EW), the EW enters onto the data entry form the resource and monthly income for each household member, plus the total calculated monthly budget for the household. This form is given to the terminal operator who enters the information into the system. The system performs an on-line edit of the calculated income for each member to determine that it equals the calculated total for the household.

- ***Benefit Calculation.*** The system calculates the FSP benefits. According to FSP support staff, the system is "always correct." EWs authorize benefits for new and ongoing cases. In the case of new EWs, the supervisor will review each case for errors. After that, standard second-party reviews are performed on all cases.

- ***Benefit Issuance.*** The State's Central Issuance Unit mails all food stamp coupons. Expedited issuance requests are processed the day after FACTS receives field office input. Expedited benefits are mailed immediately to clients. There are on-line issuance screens that permit update and cancellation of benefits as well as an on-line issuance history. Arkansas is evaluating the feasibility of an Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) issuance system, but does not believe that it will be able to demonstrate cost neutrality because of Regulation E.

- ***Notices.*** FACTS automatically generates recipient notices and permits workers to generate notices. Only on the manually-prepared notices do workers have the ability to add text. AFDC and FSP notices are not combined at this time and there are no plans to do so in the near future. DHS issues approximately 41,000 FSP notices each month.

- ***Claims System.*** A separate system, the Overpayments System, maintains on-line records of claims outstanding and of claims collected. Based on the total overpayment amount that was manually calculated by the case worker and entered into the claim that was submitted to the Recovery Unit, the Overpayments System

automatically calculates the appropriate monthly recoupment amount and subtracts that amount from the recipients' monthly benefit.

- ***Computer Matching.*** IEVS matches are performed both during registration for duplicate participation, and after registration but before the interview. ESD and Social Security Administration (SSA) matches are performed at other times, depending upon the source schedule. The system verifies SSNs. Computer matching is performed in both a batch and an on-line mode. DHS utilizes a targeting plan that focuses on items that are most cost effective. The worker is provided with a paper printout of IEVS matches and can access the pending file for status of the match resolution.

  DHS submitted a change to its IEVS targeting plan to discontinue follow up on IRS matches since the match is not cost effective. FNS approved the plan.

  Arkansas wants to change the reporting requirements to report one month out of every quarter. DHS would track the quarterly report form and close the case if benefits were not requested. This would reduce the case activity to three reports and one applicant interview each year. This also would help to consolidate IEVS. Although Arkansas was told by FNS that quarterly reporting was only for New York, FNS has approved a series of waivers to allow the state to operate a quarterly reporting system. Policy and system changes are being designed to support quarterly reporting.

  According to DHS, the two most effective databases for matching recipients are Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX).

- ***Alerts.*** The system provides alerts for case follow-up and partially-automated alerts for disqualification. There are no alerts for verifications or pending actions. The average number of alerts per worker is 841, including IEVS alerts.

- ***Monthly Reporting.*** Arkansas received a waiver from FNS to extend certification of households to 12 months. This amounts to 70 percent of its caseload. Arkansas has applied to FNS to receive a waiver to operate a quarterly reporting system.

- ***Report Generation.*** OIS creates a EBCDIC file on reel-to-reel tape that is later converted to ASCII by users in the central office. The ASCII file is imported into dBASE and then into a Q&A file for reporting. The State can send Q&A files to the counties. The software package FOCUS is being used in some areas. The purpose of this effort is to reduce mainframe processing time, which is very expensive, and provide users with information for their reports. The system provides information that is used to prepare FNS reports but does not produce the FNS reports.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** Electronic mail (CC:Mail) is

July 1995. Without enhanced Federal funding there is no incentive to pursuing further automation in FSP, especially since Arkansas' error rates are under six percent. According to EMS staff, the implementation of an integrated system would increase the monthly operational costs significantly.

With regard to EBT, Arkansas is in the process of developing a Planning APD (PAPD). Because Arkansas's issuance costs are very low, it will be difficult to demonstrate cost neutrality; however, as no State has implemented EBT statewide under the current regulations, there is no basis for the estimation of EBT costs for Arkansas in the current legislative environment. Arkansas is especially concerned with Regulation E, indicating it would probably never reach a pilot stage as long as Regulation E was in effect.

With regard to the Work Information System Exchange (WISE), the automated system which will support Income Maintenance caseworkers in AFDC's JOBS and FSP'S E&T Programs, Arkansas hopes to have the system ready for testing by the end of February or early March 1994. A pilot implementation is expected to follow two to three months later. Statewide training would begin in late summer or early fall and the system would be implemented statewide in the winter of 1994.

Arkansas is now working on welfare reform proposals and believes that WISE (which supports JOBS and E&T) will be compatible with these welfare reform proposals.

To prevent potential internal fraud with FACTS, Arkansas plans to enhance FACTS system audit trails by linking the terminal operator number to each transaction, as well as to the terminal. This was to be accomplished by the end of 1993.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

There is little information available on the initial development phases of FACTS. Somewhat more information is available in the 1980 APD for the on-line FACTS development effort, but few people who were involved in these efforts were still available. Although FACTS is a stand-alone FSP system, a lack of funding has forestalled any efforts at the integration of FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid systems.

A year ago, DHS held a meeting on integrating AFDC, Medicaid, and FSP into one system. Since then, however, a lack of funding has put this effort on hold. Some staff visited Connecticut and New Mexico to look at their integrated systems but determined at the time that Arkansas could not afford either of these systems.

There have been very few changes to the system since 1987-1988, when DHS expanded the FACTS file structure to add data elements to do case budgets. Some edits were added at this time and some of the Customer Information Control System (CICS) transactions were made more efficient.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

Prior to the implementation of on-line FACTS, EWs determined eligibility and calculated benefits, entering the requisite information into an input document that was sent to the central office in Little Rock. These documents were batched and sent to data processing where the documents were keyed and the files updated. Turnaround documents generated by the update process were then mailed to the field offices. This batch system had difficulty meeting the timeframes for the delivery of benefits to the client population.

The November 1980 APD for on-line processing was intended to enhance this existing batch system by providing an on-line capability in field offices.

4.2 Justification for the New System

DHS justified adding on-line data input capabilities to the existing automated FSP system because it would:

- Increase processing speed, allowing workers to update cases and allowing more extensive use of direct mail for the issuance of FSP benefits.
- Reduce administrative costs, through increases in direct mail capabilities and reductions of data entry and issuance staff at the central office.
- Improve client service.
- Enhance the accuracy of data input through system edits and prevent duplicate certification by preventing the addition of already existing cases in the master file.
- Reduce certification errors through on-line access by county offices to ESD's wage/salary information.
- Increase staff efficiency.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Historical information on the development and implementation of FACTS is limited to the 1980 APD for the on-line FACTS system which provides some information on what the State planned to do when it submitted the APD.

In November 1979, DHS submitted an APD to develop an automated FSP system. FNS approved this first phase in July 1980. FACTS was developed and implemented first in a batch mode (for one year). In November 1980, DHS submitted an APD to turn the batch system into an on-line system which required additional equipment and development. Outputs, files, information storage and retrieval, and system interfaces remained unchanged. The last county was implemented by January 1982. In December 1987, the State submitted an APD for printers to be placed in county offices to serve

AFDC, Medicaid, and FSP and submitted a subsequent APD for 115 PCs and 24 more printers.

4.4. Conversion Approach

Training is conducted by the DMS Staff Development Section. FACTS training was conducted on-site in the counties. Terminal operators did not have formal training, but were taught by experienced operators. The EW training lasted two weeks.

The first system conversion began in March 1980. Turnaround documents had to be completed on all cases because of the small amount of information that was available. Conversion necessitated the data entry of data collected during monthly or recertification interviews and was accomplished by contractors hired for the purpose. The batch system became fully operational in December 1981.

In 1987, when the last enhancements were made to FACTS, the central office and field representatives conducted training in the county offices.

4.5 Project Management

The project manager was from the FSP functional area and had 13 years of PA experience, including 3 years of project management experience. The project manager also had background in automatic data processing (ADP). The State committed its best staff to the project and continued to show strong support through all project phases.

There were two review teams. One was staffed with county office personnel and reviewed all products; the other was made up of central office personnel and reviewed all interfaces with other systems and departments.

The DHS FSP administrator served as the project monitor for developing the on-line capabilities of FACTS. His prior experience included field work and central office experience in the program as well as experience with management and systems analysis.

4.6 FSP Participation

During 1978 to May 1979, user representatives from the field and from issuance developed system requirements and specifications for the batch automated system. When the system was enhanced to provide on-line input from the county offices, the project team included seven central office staff who had field and supervisory experience either in income maintenance or FSP, plus workers and supervisors from the field.

4.7 MIS Participation

Management information systems (MIS) activities in Arkansas are accomplished by DMS. During system development and implementation there were four managers from the PA side, 17 programmer/analysts, and 33 programmers. There were also two managers, three

system analysts, and one test analyst from DCS. There were 30 other MIS staff involved in various capacities.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

The on-line pilot was delayed slightly by additional acceptance testing and user training changes. These activities delayed implementation for a few months. Part of the problem was due to the particular county picked for the pilot project, as it had characteristics that were atypical of the State as a whole. State personnel indicated that a better approach would have been to perform more complete acceptance testing up front and implement pilot testing in more than one county.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Arkansas personnel studied the Florida, Louisiana, and Oklahoma systems as potential transfer candidates, but they ended up developing FACTS in house, using concepts they had seen in other systems. They did not feel that any of the systems they examined had the right mix of functionality and size for Arkansas.

The State would like a system that fully integrates all programs and has recently investigated systems in Michigan, Texas, California, Kentucky, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and New Mexico, but it did not see any systems that support the complex functionality required by Arkansas.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of FACTS. The description includes a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

- **Mainframe:** IBM 3090-200E, under ESA,
  128 MB main, 256 MB extended
  IBM 3090-150E, for development
- **Disk:** IBM 3380, IBM 3390, double and triple density;
  Amdahl 6880/6280
- **Tape:** STK 4410 cartridge silo,
  IBM 3480 tape drive
- **Printers:** IBM 3800 page printers
  STK 5000 impact printers

- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745
- **Workstations:** 3270 type terminals or Hyundai 386 PCs
- **Telecommunications Network:** T1 lines and multiple 56 KB lines to 9600 baud tail circuits. Some direct lines to local offices.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

The operating environment of FACTS consists of several components. This section describes these components, which include the current operating system, maintenance environment, telecommunications, performance, response time, and downtime. This section also discusses the future of the system.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

The Arkansas data center is State owned and in continuous operation. There is redundant air conditioning, an uninterruptible power supply (UPS), and backup diesel generators. The State has a reciprocal agreement with IBM to provide cold site backup in case of emergency. The computer area is secured, has Halon capability, and uses all other appropriate emergency measures. ACF2 is the system security software.

The batch window is from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 a.m. The PA programming cycle is usually finished by midnight, although the monthly cycle may take until 4:00 a.m. There have not been any overruns that affected the on-line system, although batch and on-line processing could run concurrently if necessary. Maintenance is run on weekends.

The IBM 3090 operates under ESA with JES2 for batch control. Most batch processing is run at night but can sometimes continue past 7:30 a.m. Development processing and batch runs during the day are executed on one of the IBM 3090-150Es unless the processing specifically requires data from the IBM 3090-200E. The preferred database manager is IMS from IBM. Some applications use VSAM. The data center will also support DB2.

Several Computer Associates software packages are utilized to manage the data center and hardware systems. Among these are LIBRARIAN, DATACOM, DATAQUERY, IDEAL, TMS, OPERA, JCLCHECK, and EASYTREIVE PLUS. Other software vendors whose products are used to facilitate computer operations and development include Atlanta Online Systems (RLM, DPIN, IRPT), AXIOS Products (FETCH), BMC Software (OPTIMIZER), Boole and Babbage (IMF), Compuware (ABENDAID, XPEDITER), Data Base Technology (COMPRESS), GT Software (BMS/GT, ASSIST/GT), and Information Builders (FOCUS).

FACTS is comprised of approximately 400 programs in COBOL plus 50 to 100 report-producing programs.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

OIS within DMS provides applications and operational support for the automated systems that support FSP. There are 170 personnel in the data center, including 120 MIS non-operations staff. The State operations staff is relatively stable. For example, the telecommunications staff averages 15 years experience. Operations personnel include quality management teams that are tasked to increase efficiency and quality.

OIS is very short staffed and the staff is currently focusing on Medicaid changes. This has affected OIS' responsiveness to FSP users, who consider it less than optimal. Technical staffing is becoming a problem as increasing technology has increased the level of technical expertise required to deal with the system. In addition, because of budgetary constraints, there have been some layoffs and reduced work weeks.

The State does not employ a formal process for implementing system changes. Planning for system changes is done by the FSP staff. They check with OIS to see if there is room to add data elements. FSP staff will prepare detailed specifications for required changes and reports. The time required to implement system changes, according to FSP staff, is quite short. Recently, this has been an exception, as OIS staff have been focusing on Medicaid changes.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

There are over 50 independent telephone companies in Arkansas that interface with the State system. Southwest Bell acts as the intermediary for the State to these companies. There are also three T1 lines; one each to Fayetteville, Pine Bluff, and Jamesboro. All other cities are served by 56 KB lines and all lines to the local buildings are 9600 baud. Arkansas intends to convert to digital operations with all incoming lines greater than 9600 baud to better support the States telecommunication needs.

6.2.4 System Performance

FACTS utilizes an average of 29 percent of the mainframe, with a peak utilization of 76 percent, and uses about 20 percent of the 101 gigabytes of storage available.

Performance monitoring takes place almost entirely in reaction to user calls and inquiries. There are approximately 5 million transactions per month or 150,000 to 200,000 per day. FACTS is involved with less than 2,000 of this daily number. Each FACTS transaction translates to an average of 11 database calls.

The current number of records on FACTS is a little less than 250,000.

6.2.5 System Response

FSP workers indicated that the system was generally responsive on most transactions, at between one and five seconds. The last county on a multidrop line may have response

time slower than this, but this is the exception. Generally, if a larger county is experiencing response times over five seconds, the central help desk is contacted. Response time is not as important in Arkansas as it is in other States because the EWs only inquire about clients on-line, all other information is entered in batch mode from coding sheets. It usually requires about one month to implement mass changes such as a new basis of issuance or cost-of-living adjustments.

6.2.6 System Downtime

System downtime is not a problem; the system has a performance record of 99.8 percent.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

The State legislature authorized a three-month fact finding and feasibility study on the use of EBT for all Medicaid and PA programs. The structure of the system would be that of a public/private partnership.

The State wants to foster more EW access to the data. To this end, the State is pursuing goals such as distributed processing, more T1 lines, digital telecommunications, etc.

The State plans to upgrade the processor to a 3090-400E or equivalent alternative. All Amdahl direct access storage devices (DASD) will be replaced with more current technology such as IBM 3390s, 3380s, or equivalents. The 9-track tape drives will be replaced by another silo. Page printers will replace the current impact printers and a roll feeder will be added for speed and efficiency.

Arkansas wants to put a fiber optic network around the Capitol complex and implement Token Ring Ethernet WAN/LAN technology throughout the State.

7.0 COSTS AND COST ALLOCATION

This section of the report identifies the system development costs and level of Federal funding, ADP operational costs, and the cost allocation methodologies for development and operational costs.

The system was developed to replace a primarily manual system with limited data processing support. It was developed in two phases and was upgraded in 1987. Due to the age of FACTS, DHS maintains limited amounts of development cost data, Federal financial participation (FFP) data, funding approval correspondence, and APD material.

7.1 FACTS Development Costs and Federal Funding

OIS, which is responsible for developing systems which support DHS, developed FACTS. The initial FACTS APD was submitted in November 1979 to request funding for the first

phase of the automated FSP system. The system was to be developed to support FSP only. Approval was obtained in July 1980. The system was designed and implemented as a batch-mode system.

An APD was submitted in November 1980 for the on-line portion of FACTS. Costs were projected to be $65,180.[4] This request was fully approved by FNS. An APD to provide printers for county offices was submitted in December 1987 for $366,668. This hardware request was fully approved by FNS. FNS funded 56.5 percent of the hardware costs.

7.1.1 WISE Development Costs and Federal Funding

WISE, which will support AFDC's JOBS and FSP's E&T Programs, is currently being developed. WISE development costs are shared between AFDC and FSP. WISE funding is being provided by FNS and costs are appearing on SF-269s under 50 percent ADP Development. Development costs to date related to WISE development are shown in Table 7.1, WISE Development Costs 1990-1992.

Currently WISE development cost allocation is 73 percent to FSP and 27 percent to AFDC. Costs that are not attributable to FSP or AFDC are allocated on the direct-costs percentage of total costs.

7.1.2 Major FACTS Development Cost Components

DHS does not maintain information on historical FACTS-development cost components. The November 1980 APD estimated FACTS on-line development cost components are shown in Table 7.2, Estimated FACTS On-Line Development Cost Components.

Table 7.1 WISE Development Costs 1990-1992[5]

Fiscal Year	FFP	Development Cost	FNS Share
1989	50%	$100,063	$50,032
1990	50%	$428,772	$214,386
1991	50%	$159,349	$79,675
1992	50%	$140,485	$70,243
TOTAL		$828,669	$414,336

[4] FACTS November 1980 APD.

[5] SF-269 50% ADP Development Costs for the corresponding years.

Table 7.2 Estimated FACTS On-Line Development Cost Components

FACTS Development Cost Component	Costs
System Design, Programming and Testing	$12,553
System Evaluation	$2,400
Implementation and Training	$50,227
Total	**$65,180**

7.2 FACTS Operational Costs

Since FACTS is not an integrated system, all operating costs can be directly attributed to FSP support. Operational support is provided by DMS; OIS provides applications support. The operating cost components of FACTS are shown in Table 7.3, FACTS Operating Cost Components. FSP ADP operational costs during the last seven years are shown in Table 7.4, FSP Operating Costs 1986-1992.

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

The monthly cost per case for FY 1992 was $.82. This cost was calculated using the 1992 FSP monthly caseload of 102,489 households and the 1992 average monthly FSP share of ADP operational costs, $84,311.

Table 7.3 FACTS Operating Cost Components

Cost Component	Description
OIS	Salaries of OIS staff supporting FACTS operations
DCS Billings	DCS computer charges for FACTS (i.e., CPU time, storage)
Research and Statistics	Performs costs allocations and analysis of statistics
FSP Administrative/Program Support	Salaries and Benefits of staff supporting FACTS
Rent	Rent of the building which houses FACTS operation support staff
Indirect Costs	Those costs which are not attributable to one program but are shared among programs

Table 7.4 FSP Operating Costs 1986-1992

Fiscal Year	Operational Cost	FNS Cost at 50% FFP
1986	$1,108,390	$554,195
1987	$1,038,452	$519,226
1988	$1,064,406	$532,203
1989	$895,821	$447,911
1990	$746,462	$373,231
1991	$742,254	$371,127
1992	$1,011,732	$505,866
TOTAL	**$6,607,517**	**$3,303,759**

7.2.2 ADP Operational Costs Control Measures and Practices

OIS tracks costs associated with FACTS operations. ADP charges are tracked by job numbers. Job numbers are related to specific program functions (e.g., FSP processing). Services are broken down into central processing unit (CPU) time, production time, print lines, on-line transactions, and DASD space. Charges which can not be attributed to a specific program are sent to Research and Statistics for program allocation. Programmer/analyst time is tracked and coded with the appropriate program/activity charge code.

7.3 Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the cost allocation methodologies used by DHS to allocate costs associated with FACTS operations and WISE development. The cost allocation plan currently being used was approved by FNS. The cost allocation plan and cost allocation methodologies are developed and maintained by the Research and Statistics Unit of DMS.

7.3.1 FACTS and WISE Development Cost Allocation Methodology

Since the FACTS system supports only FSP, FACTS development costs were not allocated among several programs. Therefore, all FACTS development costs were funded by FNS. Detailed information on FACTS development cost is not available.

WISE development funding is shared between FNS and AFDC. The development components and their allocation basis is shown in Table 7.5.

7.3.2 FACTS Operating Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics

A cost-allocation system housed on the mainframe is used to allocate costs into and out of the appropriate accounts. OIS of DMS generates the *Computer Services Cost Report* following the end of each month. This report is used as the basis of the allocation for DCS cost pools. The report indicates the program code with the appropriate process time, along with dollar values to be charged directly to programs. The difference between these direct charges and the total DCS billing submitted by DCS is then allocated based upon the proportion of each program's process time to the total process time. The percentages generated in this manner are also used to allocate the management-support cost pool since they are defined as being associated costs to the computer processing costs.

Operating cost components may have several cost pools associated with them. These cost pools break expenditures down to the activity level within major operating cost components. These activities are usually associated with a unit or section. Units and sections refer to a specific function or activity performed. FACTS operating cost components and their associated cost pools are shown in Table 7.6, FACTS Operating Cost Components Cost Pools.

Table 7.5 WISE Development Cost Components

WISE Development Cost Component	Description	Allocation Basis

Direct-charge billing costs are charged directly to the specific program which is supported. The units include all those which make up the OIS operational cost component. Direct-charge billings and the OIS billing make up the largest FACTS operating expenditures. Research and Statistics makes up a very small portion of operational costs, generally falling under one percent of total costs.[6] Costs are charged directly to FSP ADP operations. Research and Statistics personnel time is allocated based on a random moment time study. Prior to the beginning of the quarter, the number of workers participating in the time study is verified. A valid sample is determined of the number of times per day each worker must record time. The rent fee allocated to FACTS operations is determined by a head count of filled positions in the various cost centers. The allocation/billing bases for each FACTS operating costs component is shown in Table 7.7, FACTS Operating Cost Components Allocation/Billing Bases.

Those expenditures not fitting into one of the 14 SF-269 categories are prorated across all SF-269 items. They are prorated based on the proportion of category expenditure to total SF-269 costs. The prorated amounts appear in the indirect cost component for each expenditure category.

Table 7.6 FACTS Operating Cost Components Cost Pools

Cost Component	Cost Pools	Description
OIS	600-30-01-00	**Information Systems Management** - This section is responsible for the overall management and operation of DHS systems.
	600-30-02-00	**Information Systems Planning Administration** - This section is responsible for the overall guidance and supervision of information systems planning and microcomputer application development.
	600-30-03-00	**Application Development Administration**
	600-30-04-00	**Management Support Administration** - This section is responsible for the overall guidance and supervision of management.
	600-30-05-00	**User Support** - This section is responsible for the overall guidance and supervision of user support.
DCS Billings	600-30-01-00	**Information Systems Management** - This section is responsible for the overall management and operation of DHS systems.
Research and Statistics	500-05-05	**Research and Statistics** - This unit is responsible for the collection, compilation, verification, analysis, and reporting of statistical data for the major DHS programs.

[6] Based on 9/91 and 10/91 Cost Allocation Reports.

Table 7.7 FACTS Operating Cost Components Allocation/Billing Bases

Operating Cost Component	Allocation Basis/Billing Basis
Information Systems	Time studies
DCS Billings	Direct charges to the program
Research and Statistics	Random moment sampling time studies
FSP Administrative/Program Support	Direct costs charges to program based on time sheets Indirect costs allocated based on direct cost program proportions of total costs
Rent	Filled position head count
Indirect Costs	Prorated across all SF-269 items

APPENDIX A

STATE OF ARKANSAS

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally-Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	Y
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	Y
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92 *	Y	N	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92 *	Y (2/1/92)	N	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	N	N	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	Y	Y	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	Y	Y	Y

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally-Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89 *	N	N	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	Y
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	N	N
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	N	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	N

* These dates were changed after the State completed this form and the site visit occurred; therefore, the responses to these particular regulatory changes may be inaccurate.

Exhibit A-6.1
State of Arkansas
Hardware Inventory

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090-200E	IBM	Purchase	128 MB main storage, 32 channels
3090-150E	IBM	Purchase	64 MB main storage, 16 channels (2)
DASD			
3380	IBM	Purchase	BE4 (2)
TAPE			
3480-A22	IBM	Purchase	Tape control unit (2)
3480-B22	IBM	Purchase	Magnetic tape drive (16)
3281	Memorex Telex	Purchase	Tape control unit
3288	Memorex Telex	Purchase	Magnetic tape drive (4)
PRINTERS			
3800	IBM	Purchase	Page printer (2)
5000-50, 5000-21	Storagetek	Purchase	Impact printer (2)
262	Memorex Telex	Purchase	Printer
820	Paradyne	Purchase	Printer
FRONT ENDS			
3745-410	IBM	Purchase	Communications controller
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
PC	Zenith	Purchase	Personal computers (3)
11xx, 14xx	Memorex Telex	Purchase	Terminals (24)

APPENDIX B

STATE OF ARKANSAS

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility workers in Arkansas. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Arkansas. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The survey was sent to 63 eligibility workers. The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Arkansas	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
504	63	6.5%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	33	52.3%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Arkansas. Because the response rate was 52 percent, the conclusions and observations made on the basis of the frequency may not be representative of all EWs since a less than optimal number of surveys were returned.

Since Arkansas' current system has been operational for more than ten years, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Questions that compare the old system and current system are therefore not included.

Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents are satisfied with the computer system in Arkansas. They generally find it responsive, accurate, and fairly easy to use. Two complaints are that response time is sometimes too slow and that the system is down too often.

Most respondents also think the computer system helps them do their jobs and makes them more efficient, although 30 percent feel that the system adds stress to their jobs.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	1	3.0
Good	24	72.7
Excellent	8	24.2

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	3	9.1
Good	27	81.8
Excellent	3	9.1

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	33.3
Sometimes	21	63.6
Often	1	3.0

Almost all of the eligibility workers think the system response time is generally good but a significant proportion (64 percent) indicate that response time is often too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	12	36.4
Often	21	63.6

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	56.3
Sometimes	14	43.8

Most of the eligibility workers feel the system is available when they need to use it. Although 44 percent also think that the system is sometimes down, this does not detract from the perception that the system is generally available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Good	28	84.8
Excellent	5	15.2

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	72.7
Sometimes	9	27.3

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	93.9
Sometimes	2	6.1

How often is the systems data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	66.7
Sometimes	9	27.3
Often	2	6.1

The eligibility workers overwhelmingly think the system's data and computations are quite accurate.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	54.5
Sometimes	15	45.5

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	69.7
Sometimes	10	30.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	75.0
Sometimes	3	18.8
Often	1	6.3

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	81.5
Sometimes	5	18.5

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	74.2
Sometimes	6	19.4
Often	2	6.5

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	76.0
Sometimes	5	20.0
Often	1	4.0

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	93.8
Sometimes	1	6.3

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	75.0
Sometimes	8	25.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	81.8
Sometimes	6	18.2

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	90.0
Sometimes	3	10.0

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	90.6
Sometimes	3	9.4

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	86.7
Sometimes	3	10.0
Often	1	3.3

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	85.0
Sometimes	3	15.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	69.2
Sometimes	7	26.9
Often	1	3.8

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	70.0
Sometimes	8	26.7
Often	1	3.3

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	80.0
Sometimes	5	16.7
Often	1	3.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	70.4
Sometimes	8	29.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	69.6
Sometimes	6	26.1
Often	1	4.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	65.2
Sometimes	6	26.1
Often	2	8.7

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	86.2
Sometimes	3	10.3
Often	1	3.4

The eligibility workers generally feel that the system is easy to use. Most report rarely having difficulty performing most of their usual functions. Almost half, however, indicated some difficulty tracking outstanding verifications. There is also a significant percentage, over 50 percent, who feel that suspected fraud cases are difficult to identify.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	2	6.1
Sometimes	5	15.2
Often	26	78.8

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	69.7
Sometimes	9	27.3
Often	1	3.0

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	81.3
Sometimes	6	18.8

The eligibility workers are generally satisfied with the system although a significant percentage (30 percent) find that it adds stress to their work.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	72.7
Sometimes	8	24.2
Often	1	3.0

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	83.3
Sometimes	5	16.7

Most eligibility workers agreed that expedited service is rarely difficult to provide.

Fraud and Errors

Because Alabama's system was implemented more than five years ago, this section comparing the current system to the previous system was not applicable.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF ARKANSAS

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of supervisors in Arkansas. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Arkansas. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The survey was sent to 30 local office supervisors. The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of Supervisors in Arkansas	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
122	30	24.5%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	25	75.8%

Although the proportion of supervisors selected to receive the survey is small, they were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of the population of supervisors in Arkansas. The response rate of 73 percent is good, producing a sample whose responses should be representative of supervisors in Arkansas.

Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors think the system is very good and helps them in their jobs. Almost all respondents found the system easy to learn and use.

Since Arkansas' current system has been operational for more than ten years, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Questions that compare the old system and current system are therefore not included.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	21	84.0
Excellent	4	16.0

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	16.0
Good	18	72.0
Excellent	3	12.0

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	12	48.0
Sometimes	11	44.0
Often	2	8.0

The supervisors who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent although over half (52 percent) think the system response time is too slow sometimes or often.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	4.0
Sometimes	1	4.0
Often	23	92.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	13	52.0
Sometimes	12	48.0

The supervisors who responded almost all think the system is generally available, although half think it is sometimes down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	4.0
Good	19	76.0
Excellent	5	20.0

The supervisors who responded generally find the information and algorithms of the system to be accurate. Almost all of them think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	56.0
Sometimes	11	44.0

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	13	52.0
Sometimes	11	44.0
Often	1	4.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	38.5
Sometimes	7	53.8
Often	1	7.7

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	16	72.7
Sometimes	6	27.3

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	79.2
Sometimes	5	20.8

A majority of the supervisors do not find it difficult to obtain information or to learn the system although a significant percentage experience some difficulty in these areas. Those who responded rarely have difficulty performing such specific tasks as restoring benefits or generating warning notices.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	4.0
Sometimes	3	12.0
Often	21	84.0

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	56.0
Sometimes	6	24.0
Often	5	20.0

Most of the supervisors who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work and most feel that it rarely contributes added stress.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	22	88.0
Excellent	3	12.0

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	4.0
Good	18	72.0
Excellent	6	24.0

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	50.0
Sometimes	7	38.8
Often	2	11.1

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	47.1
Sometimes	7	41.2
Often	2	11.8

Most of the supervisors responding think the system helps them in their management tasks, with 100 percent thinking the reports produced by the system are good or excellent. Almost everyone thinks the support provided by the technical staff is good or excellent.

Client Service

Because Arkansas' system was implemented more than five years ago, this section comparing the current system to the previous system was not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

Because Arkansas' system was implemented more than five years ago, this section comparing the current system to the previous system was not applicable.